against CMD RCF and 3 other officers of RCF involved and also their suspension. All these officers have been placed under suspension and the departmental enquiry against them is now in progress.

(iii) The case relating to purchase of substandard extruded packing material: The allegation is that the CMD, and some other officers of RCF entered into a criminal conspiracy with a private firm in the purchase of substandard extruded packing material at exorbitant rates from the firm, thus causing a loss to the tune of Rs. 3 crores to RCF. The CBI have recommended initiation of regular departmental action for major penalty against CMD RCF and four other officers of RCF and also their suspension. The report of the CBI is being examined by the Government in consultation with CVC.

(iv) The case relating to purchase of jute and HDPE bags through the Central Purchase Committee (CPC) at exorbitant rates involving CMD, RCF, Managing Director, National Fertilizers Limited (NFL) (Since retired) and Managing Director, Krishak Bharti Cooperative Limited (KRIBHCO) (since retired). The allegations are that the Members of the Central Purchase Committee were responsible for negligence in estimating the fixed factor rates and negotiating the price with the suppliers and also for fixing the freight charges towards higher side. The CBI have recommended initiation of regular departmental action for major penalty against CMD, RCF and another officer of RCF and such action as deemed fit against the then MD, NFL and the then MD, KRIBHCO. The report of the CBI was examined by the Departmental in consultation with the Central Vigilance Commission and further action is being taken.

(c) to (e) In the case relating to purchase of jute and HDPE has through CPC, the Government, following receipt of preliminary report of the CBI, placed CMD, RCF, MD, NFL, (since retired) and MD, KRIBHCO (since retired) under suspension. The suspension of all these three Chief executives were later revoked by the Government consequent on review undertaken. CMD, RCF has however been placed under suspension again by the Government in another case relating to award of contract for painting work of RCF. Regular departmental action for major penalty against CMD, RCF and other officers as recommended by CBI is now in progress in this case.

**Appeal against Rule 30-A of IDPL CDA Rules**

2908. SHRI MD. SALIM: Will the PRIME MINSTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1148 given in the Rajya Sabha on 7th May, 1992 and state:

(a) whether the affected employees have made an appeal to the authorities for the adverse orders, when there is no mention of appeal on it;

(b) if so, the reasons for not mentioning appeal in rule 30-A, when an appeal is mentioned and provided for allot her rules including dismissal and removal from services, in the IDPL|CDA Rues;

(c) whether the affected empolyees (under 30-A) were informed about it or not (as per (b) above) after receiving their appeal, together with resons therefor;

(d) within how many time period the cases under 30-A of the aggrieved persons are reviewed, with reasons therefor; and

(e) with in how many much time period the aggrieved persons are informed on the action of (d) above?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (e) The employees referred to in the question were holding posts below the Board level. In respect of such employees, the authority competent to take a decision is the management of the company. According to the information furnished by Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd. (IDPL), one of the two employees namely, Shri Kamal Bhasin had made an appeal on his own. There is no specific provision for an appeal against an order passed under Rule 30-A of the IDPL CDA Rules, 1978, as the rule can be invoked only in specific circumstances and the decision is taken at the highest level of the undertaking after the prior scrutiny of a Screening Committee, and for reasons to be recorded in writing. The 'Appeal' made by the said emplpoyee is, therefore, inadmissible under the rules. An order passed under the IDPL CDA Rules, including Rule 30-A, can be reviewed in terms of the general provisions contained in Rule 33 of the said rules. No review petition has been received by IDPL from the affected employee.

**Difference in prices of generic and brand names**

2909. SHRI ANANT RAM JAISWAL: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the prices of drug with generic names are substantially higher than these with brand names;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether Government are also aware that many drug units, including some multinational have either switched over or are switching over to generic names from their own brand names; and

(d) if so, what are the names of such units and what action has been taken or is being taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) Yes Sir. This has been observed in certain cases.

(b) As per the provisions of DPCO, 1987, single ingredient formulations, based on the bulk drugs specified in the second schedule and sold under generic name are exempt from price control.

(c) Yes Sir.

(d) Usage of generic name is not prohibited under DPCO, 1987. To the extent information is available details are given in the Statement enclosed.

**Statement**

*Details of products being sold under Generic name at a price higher than the approved prices for branded products*

| Sl. No. | Name of the Product | Name of the Co/ics | Pack Size |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Chloramphenicol Caps. 250mg. | Parke-Davis & Dey's Med. Store | 10's Strip |
| 2 | Thioridazine Hel Tabs. 5mg. | Sandoz (I) Ltd. | (5×20)'s Strip. |